

Cox 1999-0767A

Remarks

Reconsideration of remaining claims 2, 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

In the Office action dated December 31, 2003 (application Paper No. 8), the Examiner objected to claims 1 and 3, and rejected all pending claims under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over various cited references. The Examiner's objection and rejections will be discussed below in the order appearing in the Office action.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 3 were first objected to by the Examiner as using symbols that were "undefined". Inasmuch as further definitional support is not in the specification, claims 1 and 3 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections***A. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection - Claims 1-3***

The Examiner first rejected claims 1-3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,044,343 (Cong et al.) in view of US Patent 5,704,004 (Li et al.). Claims 1 and 3 have been cancelled, and claim 2 has incorporated the pertinent subject matter of claim 1 and is now an independent claim. In response to the Examiner's rejection, applicants assert that neither Cong et al. nor Li et al. is related to a "bit stream based" speech recognition system, which is the subject matter of the present invention. The "steady state threshold T" of Li et al. is associated with performing speech compression (on the transmission side of the system). The threshold "T" of the present invention is associated with an acceptable difference between the LSPs of adjacent frames. The two are considered to be distinct.

For these reasons, applicants assert that pending claim 2, as amended, is now allowable over the cited Cong et al. and Li et al. references. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find claim 2 to be in condition for allowance.

Cox 1999-0767A

B. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection - Claims 4 and 5

Claims 4 and 5 were next rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cong et al. and Li et al. (as above), in further view of US Patent 6,230,124 (Maeda). Maeda discloses a system wherein error detection is provided by using a check code created from "important" bits.

However, the combination of Maeda with Cong et al. and Li et al. still lacks any teaching of a bitstream based speech recognition system as defined by claim 2, from which claims 4 and 5 depend. Without this teaching, therefore, applicants assert that claims 4 and 5, in their present form, are in condition for allowance.

In summary, the present case contains claims 2, 4 and 5, where claim 2 has incorporated the limitations of claim 1 and is now considered to be in condition for allowance. Thus, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the objection and rejections, and find the case, in its present form to be in condition for allowance. If for some reason or other the Examiner does not agree that the case is ready to issue, and believes that an interview or telephone conversation would further the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Vandervoort et al.

By: Wendy W. Koba
Wendy W. Koba
Reg. No. 30509
Attorney for applicants
610-346-7112

Date: 3/31/04